DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 113 CS 505 564

AUTHOR Miller, Keith A.
TITLE Developing an Extended Degree Program Takes More Than Wheels: General Considerations and Issues in Getting Started.
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (58th, Salt Lake City, UT, February 14-17, 1987).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; Adult Education; *Curriculum Development; *Extension Education; Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Development; Faculty Mobility; Higher Education; Mobile Educational Services; Noncampus Colleges; *Nontraditional Education; Nontraditional Students; Off Campus Facilities; *Planning; Program Development; *Speech Communication; Speech Curriculum; Speech Instruction

ABSTRACT

Noting that creating an extension education program is more complicated than merely transporting an existing program to an off-campus site, this paper discusses the preliminary issues relevant to deciding whether or not a communication department should develop an extended degree program. The paper first discusses the nature of nontraditional students and of extended degree programs. It then discusses various ways these programs may be structured and the components of these programs. Finally, general considerations for initial department discussions are outlined, including the type of outreach effort desired, administrative issues, student issues, curricular issues, faculty issues, and quality control. (SRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED280113

DEVELOPING AN EXTENDED DEGREE PROGRAM TAKES MORE THAN WHEELS:

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS AND ISSUES IN GETTING STARTED

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Keith A. Miller, Ph.D.

University of Wyoming

Western Speech Communication Association
Salt Lake City

February 13-17, 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Keith A. Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505564

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

NEED. The imperative for colleges and universities to be involved in serving nontraditional student populations is clear. Not only are traditional campuses experiencing enrollment declines, but an increasing percentage of the students who are available are nontraditional, older, adult students, many of whom are unable to come to a campus. There is also, however, the sobering realization that formal educational institutions are providing only a relatively small proportion of the educational opportunities which do exist for this population. Business and industry, private non-profit organizations, and the military are providing nearly one-half of all continuing education programs in this country (Cabell, 1985).

FOCUS OF PAPER. This discussion will exclude from its consideration a great deal of educational activity which goes under the title of "continuing education" (i.e., individual courses offered off-campus whether for credit or non-credit). It also excludes those programs which are designed to award external degrees with little or no formally organized classroom content. Instead, it will focus on the academic unit, generally an academic department, which wishes to establish an off-campus degree program at a site remote from its parent institution. Where the term "department" is used below, it is in reference to a traditionally organized Communication department or other similar academic unit. The overall thrust is on getting started--on what to consider at an early stage in a Communication department's deliberations on whether or not to develop an extended degree program. The paper is intended to stimulate discussion on relevant <u>early</u> issues. Literally thousands of volumes have been written and devoted to "how to" problems and several prominent national conferences are held each year for sharing ideas about the structure and nature of extended programs. This paper attempts to speak to those faculty at the departmental level in the initial stages of deciding <u>whether</u>, rather than <u>how</u>.

NONTRADITIONAL STUDENTS. College students in the 1980s differ from traditional students in several significant ways. Chickering (1985) noted six characteristics differentiating current from past students and suggested that while the differences are rather simple and obvious, they have profound implications.

1. Older students "have many demands on their time, energy, and emotions."
2. They "reflect a wide range of individual differences that are much more sharply etched, more deeply engraved in adults than in adolescents."
3. They "will have had more, and more varied experiences, in human relationships on the job, in the community, with families, with friends, and through travel than younger people."

4. They are "embedded in a wide range of ongoing experiences and responsibilities at work, in the community, in the family."
5. They are "much more concerned about practical applications than their adolescent counterparts."
6. "These students are accustomed to being self-directed, to carrying responsibility for themselves."

Off-campus, extended programs must account in some measure for such differences in order to be successful.

In other words, offering an extended program takes more than wheels for purposes of transporting it--it represents a rather fundamental alteration of the academic enterprise as a majority of the higher education community has known it for much of this century.

EXTENDED DEGREE PROGRAMS: FIRST WARNINGS

To talk of extended degree programs means to talk of nontraditional programs. To Kirby (1981):

> Nontraditional study is more an attitude than a system and thus can never be defined except tangentially. This attitude has the student first and institution second, concentrates more on the former's need than on the latter's convenience, encourages diversity of individual opportunity rather than uniform prescription, and deemphasizes times [and] space...in favor of competence and, where applicable, performance.

It is thus not only to imply the capturing of new bodies for a department by moving a program off-campus, but also to launch the department into the realm of putting a fine edge on its conception and definition of the educational services it delivers. It is to force the tough discussions and decisions about what it does, what it wants to do, and to speculate on how well it might do it. If done responsibly, the decision to consider mounting an extended degree program should trigger an intensive soul-searching, an assessment of commitment and a self-evaluation which, even if it results in abandoning the idea, should prove to be a positive step in strengthening the traditional on-campus program by focusing the discussion on strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities of your specific department and program.

At the outset, it should be recognized that any Communication department not willing to develop a quality extended degree program should give up the desire to establish any such program at all. It is instructional to remember that "to lessen the quality of the opportunity is to lessen the equality of it" (Campbell, 1982).

To develop a program based solely on the desire to increase headcount by merely putting the existing program on wheels with little or no thought to its fit and contribution to the target population is likely to drain the department of both material and intangible resources necessary to keep the traditional on-campus program viable.

NONTRADITIONAL PROGRAM STRUCTURES AND ELEMENTS

PROGRAM STRUCTURES. While some alternatives to the traditional campus serving traditional students have nearly always existed in some forms and at some times, our current concern with extended educational opportunities has evolved as much from philosophical concerns as from more recent financial and enrollment exigencies. The student activism of the 1960s and early 1970s as well as an increased public focus on poverty and its concommitant sociological and psychological components led to a generalized concern for equality of educational opportunity. It also led to an increased awareness of the importance of connecting that educational opportunity to the practical concerns of the learners, increasing numbers of whom were beginning to emerge from a population of adults already well into their lives and past the traditional time of life for a college education. The early advocates for modern extended educational opportunities were hard at work in the 1970s attempting to bridge the structural gap between traditional colleges and the potential clients in the larger community who could not interupt their lives for the significant amount of time it would take to initiate or resume earning a college degree (Watson, 1974; Cross and Valley, 1974).

At first thought, it may seem an easy task to discuss extended programs. Even a cursory review of the literature, however, soon convinces one of the complexity of the matter. As our conception of extending educational opportunity has grown from traditional extension activities involving both credit and noncredit coursework, so has the complexity of our delivery modes and sense of educational goals grown and expanded. Bolstered by the phenomenal growth of the community college concept in the 1950s/1960s, by the establishment of regional campuses and learning centers in the 1960s/1970s (primarily but not exclusively in the Southeast and Midwest), and by increasingly sophisticated electronic delivery systems, the structural diversity of extended programs has grown enormously.

Matusak and Dowd (1985) described three primary administrative structures for delivering extended degree programs based on fiscal and academic autonomy: 1) Freestanding institutions (e.g., the Thomas A. Edison State College in New Jersey and the Empire State College of New York); 2) School, College, or Division (e.g., a Division of Continuing Education or a School of Extended Studies operating as a coordinating body for an entire campus or system); and 3) Program (an extension of a traditional existing academic unit where the policies and services are merely extended to serve new populations).

Cabell (1985) described three common organizational patterns for the connection of faculty to the extended effort noting that "...just as there is no single administrative model of extension..." there is no one administrative pattern. The three approaches include 1) A College-wide responsibility (in which each school or division has a designated person to serve as a representative to the extension unit, thus connecting the traditional academic structure to the special extension unit); 2) The Joint Appointment Approach (in which faculty are jointly appointed to both the traditional academic department and the extended unit); and 3) The Special Unit Approach (in which the extension unit is organized as an autonomous unit outside the traditional structure, often with its own faculty).

Miller and Holloway (1986) reported three types of regional campus structures associated with university extension efforts: 1) Full 4-year Regional campuses (academically autonomous from the parent structure); 2) Upper-Division campuses or learning centers (both autonomous and non-autonomous); and 3) Lower-Division campuses or learning centers (autonomous, semi-autonomous, and non-autonomous).

Valley (1972), in an early conceptualization, described four general models for extending the campus: 1) The Administrative-Facilitative Model (in which learners gain access to degree programs primarily through alternative time-frame schemes); 2) The Modes of Learning Model (where the curriculum is modified to meet student interests through contract learning schemes, internships/externships, credit for prior learning, etc.); 3) The Validation Model (where institutions validate prior learning through credit-by-exam techniques or other experiences); and 4) The Complex Systems Model (a combination of these components including flexible scheduling, recognition of prior learning, credit-by-exam, contract learning, and individualized degree planning).

Finally, Medsker and Edelstein (1977) described four general approaches to extended degree programs based on the characteristics of their curricular design: 1) The Extended Campus Approach (the traditional curriculum is simply taken off-campus); 2) The Adult Degree Approach (special degrees invented for the nontraditional population such as a Bachelor of General Studies degree); 3) The Individualized Study Approach (where the curriculum is individually constructed based on the interests, background, and needs of the student); and 4) The Degree by Examination Approach (where all or a significant proportion of the student's curriculum is validated by examinations and credit awarded). Various combinations of these institutional approaches have resulted in innovative programs like "universities without walls" and even universities without professors where the structure is essentially a coordinating one (e.g., the Edison State College or the Empire State College) or a validating one (e.g., the N.Y. Board of Regents program).

PROGRAM ELEMENTS. Looking at extended degree efforts more microscopically, at their internal components, Cabell (1985) described three general categories of program elements designed to accommodate adult learners: 1) Special degree programs; 2) Different time frames; and 3) Extended (or distance-learning) options. These elements have often been developed in combination with one another. Special degree programs (e.g., Bachelor of Liberal Studies) might be made available through evening and weekend courses and seminars both on and off campus in conjunction with correspondence study and intensive, periodic residency.

Cross and others (1974) have described the elements of extension programs common to most models: 1) Administrative accommodation (including scheduling and location); 2) Teaching/learning considerations (including independent study, experiential learning, seminars, computer-assisted learning, etc.); 3) Student services (including financial aid and counseling services); and 4) Evaluation of accomplishments (including credit for prior learning).

In reality, the implementation of any extended degree opportunity tends to blur these conceptual models and elements, but it is helpful at least to label them for purposes of laying the foundation for a discussion of basic departmental considerations.

Scaling this current discussion down to manageable proportions, it will be assumed that any given Communication department will have to adapt its outreach effort to the structural possiblities of the parent institution. That is, some units may be constrained to extending through an already established school or division of extended studies; some may already have an established learning center or regional campus on which a program may be developed; or some may find no established vehicle at all in the parent structure and may need to develop an appropriate administrative structure which facilitates its extended effort. While these considerations are fundamental and important, we leave them to another discussion and another time focusing instead on more immediate and more internal decisions and discussions a faculty department initially faces in deciding whether to extend beyond its central campus boundaries.

> Extended degree programs will differ from one another in underlying educational philosophy, content, and modes of delivery. Programs which are conventional in content may be unconventional in the mode of delivery, and vice-versa; they will run the gamut and vary in degree of conventionality and unconventionality. A common principle does inform all programs, however: they are... client-centered. However radically programs may differ from one another in concept and design, all try to provide effective learning experiences geared to the educational needs of the students they serve (Medsker and Edelstein, 1977).

This implies much to the Communication department wishing to establish an external program and contains the seeds for most of the issues needing consideration, discussion, analysis, and decision.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR INITIAL DEPARTMENTAL DISCUSSIONS

No matter what the organizational structure, no matter what the conceptual model, the traditional academic department encounters a great many practical and philosophical issues and must answer a great many questions for itself in deciding whether to develop an extended program. This section of the paper will attempt to highlight a few of these issues and questions.

TYPE OF OUTREACH EFFORT DESIRED. There is no simple, single best approach to designing an extended degree program.

> Decisions...must be made in light of local considerations about the kinds of students to be served, their learning needs and styles, their location and time constraints, the availability of institutional and other resources, the missions and traditions of existing insititutions, and relative costs and efficiencies (Medsker and Edelstein 1977).

There are two fundamentally different approaches to designing an extended degree program which the department will have to consider early:

1. Setting up a model and forcing students into that mold;

2. Determining student needs and preferences and developing an organizational model to fit those needs.

The limitations of each are evident. Establishing a model acceptable to and workable within the parent institution may overlook and fail to meet some student needs. Establishing a model based exclusively on student needs may never win acceptance and support within the parent institution.

Questions which must be asked and answered at the outset include:

> Do you intend the program to be conventional or unconventional?
>
> --In content and degree goals
> --In course and other requirements
> --In delivery mode

What is your primary goal in establishing an extended program?

--To improve access to your existing program?
--To increase headcount?
--To improve the educational process by experimenting with innovative approaches to delivery?
--To develop a new degree program (or to adapt an existing one) to best meet the educational needs of the targeted population?

What are the obvious constraints to the development of your extended program and what are your plans to overcome them?

--Internal resources and abilities?
--Relationship to institutional mission and traditions of the existing structure?
--Institutional support for such efforts?
--Faculty commitment?
--Administrative commitment?
--Relative costs and returns?
--Willingness to be innovative?
--Location and dispersion of targeted population?

How will the addition of the extended program impact upon or interact with your traditional program?

Be clear about what you want to accomplish. For most extended efforts, it is unrealistic to expect to re-create the campus elsewhere or probably even to re-create the campus program at an off-campus site. Expect to build <u>on</u> the existing and identified need; do not expect to <u>build</u> the need. Does your department have the necessary strengths and components to meet that identified need? It is vital that the department be realistic in this assessment. To have even a chance for success, the departmental commitment to this building process must be real and widely shared.

ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES. According to Clarke, et al., (1984) programs which tend to succeed can be distinguished from those which do not succeed on the basis of the degree to which they satisfy three "pre-conditions for change in off-campus program development." These pre-conditions and the factors associated with each are:

<u>Academic Unit Organization</u>

Is the proposed program consistent with the stated mission of the department [and larger institution]?
Has the formal support of the administration been obtained?
Has the relationship with the formal reward system been established?

Is the financial support available to support the program?

Academic Faculty Readiness

Are the faculty experienced in program design/redesign?
Are the faculty prepared to expand their roles?
Have faculty been trained to work in nontraditional settings?
Is the faculty leadership for the program established?

Client Group Organization

Have prospective clients been identified at the site?
Do the prospective students share common interests?
Are the prospective students sponsored locally?
Is the program integrated with established community patterns?

Quite obviously, there must be some hope for financial support of the program from the larger institutional structure. While many traditional continuing education and extension efforts have grown in a self-supporting mode, it may well not be possible to develop an entire degree program in that way for your department. Will the extended program be forced to be fiscally self-sufficient, thus having to rely on the vagaries of sufficient enrollment? How large will classes have to be to insure survival? Who will control the budget and make decisions on program changes, location alterations, student populations to be served? Will the department be able to retain a sufficient amount of that control?

What institutional support systems will have to be cultivated and extended along with necessary coursework? Some minimal level of student support services will have to accompany your program into the field. A primary goal for any unit wishing to establish an extended program is the "establishing and maintaining [of] cooperative relationships with support-service units in [the] institution" (Marienau, 1985). Key support services necessary to be integrated into the extended program include:

--Recruitment and marketing functions
--Admissions functions
--Registration and records functions
--Financial aid services
--Bursar functions
--Instructional services (including library, computer, advisement, book store, etc. services)
--(Possibly) Personal student services (personal counseling, child care, parking, health care, placement, career-planning, etc.)

If there is not an already established regional campus or learning center site providing these services for the institution onto which

the department may transport its program, how will it come to provide them? Will it be possible to establish the minimum level necessary?

Will it be possible to operate outside the on-campus system's traditional procedures, such as adherence to standard semesterly time schedules or deadlines for submission of financial aid applications? Adapting the established campus system's procedures to deliver adequate support services to nontraditional, extended students can be a major problem in establishing an off-campus program.

Who will retain the authority for making important decisions about the extended program? Who will have the responsibilities? Miller and Holloway (1986) reported that a major problem occurring with some frequency in off-campus programs which were located on regional campuses involved the splitting of responsibility and authority. In those cases, the local campus often had the responsiblity of developing and maintaining the degree program(s) but had little authority in matters pertaining to its development and maintenance while the parent structure had the authority, but felt little responsibility for it. Whether the split between authority and responsibility occurs between an established regional campus and the parent institution (including an academic department) or whether the split is between an academic department and its college or central administration is irrelevant. If authority and responsibility reside in separate places, the proposed program will be in trouble. What, then, are the realistic chances of your department retaining both those elements in the development of its program?

Another obvious administrative issue to consider early is the not-insignificant problem of a place to be. Where there is no established parent institutional presence in a physical plant sense at the target site, is there any possibility of linking your program with existing on-site resources such as a community college or an industrial operation or the public school system? In addition to needing a physical home, the new extended program will need to integrate itself into the community physically and psychologically as well as visually. Linking to on-site resources can aid in that process. What are your departmental options and constraints in these regards?

STUDENT ISSUES. Medsker and Edelstein (1977) identified three types of potential students in nontraditional markets:

1. Those persons with specific degree interests

2. Those clustered or "captured" at a particular location and defined by a common professional or vocational focus--e.g., employees at a government agency or in a hospital

3. Population at large interested in general or liberal studies (or even in a specialized degree area) who are constrained by geography, time,

family, economic conditions, etc. from traditional study

A very early consideration for any department wishing to develop an extended degree program is to determine its target population. Which of these population types are you interested in serving? Do you intend to capture the "correct" population for the degree program you intend to take off-campus (general curriculum; organizational communication track; etc.) or are you willing to develop a program which seeks to serve an available population and its needs? Almost no question relevant to early departmental consideration is more basic than this.

How will you assess need and potential market? How will you define and carve out that portion of the population you intend to target? In terms of assessing market potential and educational needs, broad surveys are not always the best tool.

> When used alone, survey methods tend to encourage people to dream about what they would like to learn IF: IF they have extra money; IF nothing important or attractive comes up; IF they have free time available....Formal survey-oriented needs assessment methods often are not in fact needs assessments so much as blue-sky inventories, whether the dreaming is being done by academic faculty, continuing educators, or clients themselves. Part of [one's] responsibility is to learn enough about what people are really likely to want, based on considerations of cost, time, geography, habit, personal or professional future, regional taste, etc., so that surveys can be firmly based in realities (Kerman, 1983).

> The least effective method for assessing demand is to ask people on an individual basis what they want, because people's lists of wants generally far exceed what they would realistically be able to pursue given limited resources and competing demands for their time. Studies of individuals must therefore do at least two things in addition to assessing interest or need. They must (1) ascertain the incentives or motives surrounding a particular interest or preference, and (2) they must get a sense of people's priorities (Walshok, 1982).

Walshok also noted the importance of assessing one's "marketplace position." That is, the importance of early determining what is already being provided in the community by other educational institutions, professional associations, employers, non-profit organizations, proprietary groups, etc. Not only will this knowledge aid your department in its early decisions about whether to develop @an extended program, but also may be valuable to know in order to draw upon and use existing resources in the development of your own program.

Recognize in your initial program development that today may not reflect tomorrow; that there may well be shifts in target clientele over time due to such factors as saturating the market, differences between second and third generation students compared to first generation, etc. Therefore, needs assessment activities ought to be built-into the program as a research and development effort. Will you be able to sustain such an effort?

The more general and diffuse the target population is, the more important program promotion and recruitment become. Recruitment and promotion should be linked to the program development. Recruitment and promotion will be more effective if coupled to other student services, such as career and educational counseling, admissions and orientation services. Where those systems are not or cannot be provided by the parent institution or other means at the extended site, the department may have to provide them. Is your department capable and willing to do so?

Chickering (1985) noted that the differences between traditional and nontraditional students discussed earlier in this paper (pp. 1-2) give rise to program design implications:

--Access issues
--The need for more flexible admissions criteria, orientation processes, and advising activities
--Assessment and placement processes which recognize the knowledge and competence students bring (e.g., portfolio assessment processes, credit for military and business training, etc.)
--Development of educational resources, curricular alternatives, and teaching practices which integrate practical experiences with academic and teaching activities.
--Development of a range of opportunities for collegial relationships, for collaborative planning, for self-planned and self-paced study.
--Need for new administrative structures to accommodate these changed circumstances.

At a general level, much more flexibility needs to be built into extended programs than typically exists in the traditional on-campus programs. For example, access in terms of an extended program may refer not only to <u>place</u> (i.e., off-campus), and to <u>time</u> (evenings or weekends), but also to a correlation of time and place (e.g., classes held in business and community locations and dovetailed with available times such as during noon hours at the job site or on commuter trains at 7 a.m., etc.).

Nontraditional students tend to earn "upside-down degrees." That is, they are often "experience rich/theory poor" while traditional students tend to be "theory rich/experience poor." Is the department willing (and able) to try to accommodate this difference by developing ways of incorporating their practical and life experience into the curriculum?

Is the department able (and willing) to take these differences between traditional and nontraditional students into account in the planning and design of its extended program?

CURRICULAR ISSUES. It should be realized early that the "curriculum for the alternative degree program should be truly an alternative. It should not merely mimic the curriculum of the traditional...program" (Matusak and Dowd, 1985). At the very least, the alternative should include differential access; at the best, it should take into account the targeted learners' specific needs and be tailored to meet those needs. For some departments, this may well mean a drastic redesign of its academic program to become a true alternative to the on-campus program. Is this possible administratively? attitudinally? Can new and different curricula be designed to meet the needs of the different learners or will the "day program" have to be replicated? Will the existing program meet the needs of the different population? How and in what ways?

Very early in the department's consideration of whether to develop an extended degree program, the designers should decide whether they believe that in order to be of equivalent quality the extended program has to be identical to the on-campus program or whether they feel they can design a different program which is not identical, yet which is equivalent in quality, if not focus, goals, or requirements. This is an important consideration, for many faculty long accustomed to the traditional circumstances simply assume that comparable must mean identical in terms of curricular design, requirements, and implementation. If your proposed program includes course sequences, can courses be substituted within the sequence when a prescribed course fails to enroll sufficiently? How would you handle entry points for students who wish to "sign on" in the middle of a delivery sequence?

Where changes or innovations in curricula must go through a central campus body such as a Curriculum Committee, realize early that "many innovative ideas can be lost in political battles" (Matusak and Dowd, 1985). If possible, make sure the Committee has on it advocates who can explain and defend the suggested innovations.

If the requirements for the extended degree must remain the same as the requirements for the traditional degree, differences ought to exist in delivery systems (times, places, media, etc.) or in the assessment of prior learning or credit by examination procedures or other individualized program efforts.

Curricular questions also include a careful consideration of alternative learning resources available to the targeted population and which might be incorporated into the curricular design. This would include such things as community resources (public libraries, museums, other local educational institutions, business and industrial sites for internships, etc.); resource persons (professional and technical persons from business and industry, government, or service agencies who could serve as tutors, field supervisors, adjunct instructors); materials (study guides, modular

educational packets, educational TV, videotapes, telecommunication channels, computer assisted instructional techniques, etc.). All such resources should be catalogued, evaluated for usefulness, integrated and organized for accessibility as well as updated and revised (Medsker and Edelstein, 1977). Does your department have the resources and will to engage in this activity?

FACULTY ISSUES. A fundamentally basic consideration in deciding whether or not to develop an extended degree program is how you will provide it with sufficient instructional faculty. Perhaps the first question a department needs to answer in this regard is whether it intends to deliver the degree with its existing faculty or intends to develop new faculty devoted exclusively to the extended site or some combination of both. That this depends in no small manner on available financial support is obvious. However, there are also other issues involved, such as the degree of control the parent department will have over the faculty delivering the extended degree. If on-campus faculty are used in substantial measure, this may prove a moot point. However, if the faculty primarily delivering the degree are drawn from available community resources (parttime, adjunct instructors; instructors from other educational institutions; etc.), this may be a major issue, particularly in regard to quality control issues.

At the very least, the department delivering the degree program must be involved heavily (if not exclusively) in the selection, socialization, and evaluation of the extended faculty. Will this be possible given the department's circumstances? If the on-campus faculty are not the primary instructional staff, will it be possible to assign one person to serve as the "extended degree coordinator" to assure departmental control? Note that the person best suited for the task by virtue of predisposition, interest, and native ability may not be the department chair.

Many extended degree programs rely heavily on adjunct faculty for a variety of practical reasons. If programs of faculty development (training, orientation, and socialization) and course monitoring are developed, the heavy use of adjunct faculty can often work reasonably well; if not, quality can suffer greatly.

Where fulltime, on-campus faculty are used, do not assume that they need nothing more than a car and directions to the extension site. Most likely, faculty long accustomed to traditional settings with traditional students will need at least some faculty development efforts and training, too. Will this be possible in your situation?

Whether the extended degree effort is coordinated at the institutional level (as in the School or Division of Extended Studies structure) or at the departmental level (as in the Program structure), it is best to involve the entire faculty in the development of the extended program to increase ownership and

involvement as well as commitment to it. Without a real commitment and a real interest in serving the off-campus students, a department's effort to develop and maintain an extended program is doomed to failure and will soon be abandoned as being more trouble than it is worth. What is the level of true commitment to this proposed extended effort in your department?

Will it be possible within your institutional setting to allow on-campus faculty to claim teaching in the extended program as part of load? Remember that

> ...it can hardly be argued that teaching a course which meets up to 250 miles away from the campus one evening per week for two to three hours is equivalent in terms of faculty load to walking to a campus classroom, two or three times per week to teach for 50 minutes. Presented with the choice between the off-campus on-load course and the on-campus on-load course, then, most faculty members understandably choose the on-campus assignment. The on-load off-campus teaching assignment becomes one to avoid if at all possible (Hanna, 1981).

Where fulltime faculty are assigned permanently to the extended site, there tends to develop an unhealthy personal and professional isolation which will need attention. How will the department counter the negative effects of this isolation? Are faculty rotation assignments between campus sites possible? feasible?

Other important early questions to tackle include:

--What do you consider an acceptable ratio of fulltime to parttime faculty for the extended program? Can you achieve that ratio?

--Will on-campus faculty see service in the extended program as not worth the bother?

--How will service to the extended program be viewed and evaluated with reference to traditional considerations for tenure and promotion?

--What are the on-campus faculty views concerning the nontraditional students? Will the faculty see the students as worthy or will they think the students should have attended college at a traditional age?

--Will on-campus faculty resent being away from their families and research base when required to teach in the extended program?

--If a majority of the faculty in the extended program are adjunct and parttime, will the students come to feel that they never get the "real" professors?

QUALITY CONTROL. A discussion of quality control measures is better suited for a discussion of "how-to" measures than in this current context of whether or not to even develop an extended program. Nevertheless, a few general observations and questions about quality control by the department might be instructional in the initial deliberations.

To begin with, it is useful to realize that

> For a variety of reasons, there will always be those who view any...off-campus course offerings (let alone entire degree programs) as of lesser quality than the same offerings on campus. Whether those reasons are valid, invalid, or irrelevant in any given case, the perceptions of poor quality will pose a major threat to departments contemplating such a program (Miller, et al., 1984).

Departments do well to remember that "nontraditional off-campus credit programs are not universally accepted by resident faculty....Faculty feel off-campus instruction lowers quality for both faculty and students" (Garubo, 1981). Even when your departmental faculty do not feel this way, other faculty members on campus probably do. It is for this reason that the suggestion was made earlier in this paper that a department not willing to expend considerable amounts of energy and devotion to establishing a quality off-campus program would do well to abandon the idea early. It will cost the department too dearly in its on-campus credibility if it fails to do so. Even if the quality of the extended program can be demonstrated clearly, can the proposed program gain more than fringe acceptance and status on the parent campus?

One particularly important quality control issue involves the monitoring and evaluation of parttime instructors. While it is clear that there are many good reasons for using some community persons as adjunct faculty (practitioners are often more practical than academics and thus appeal to nontraditional students; less financial burden; spares on-campus faculty the arduous task of going off-campus, etc.), it is also clear that there remain large problems with their use. Among these problems are questions of currency of information, loyalty to a departmental teaching or philosophical perspective, inexperience or disinterest in student advisement or counseling, etc.

Disturbingly, Miller and Holloway (1986) found in a large majority of regional campuses and learning centers that parttime faculty were evaluated exclusively (if at all) by the extended campus administrative structure, not by the sponsoring academic department personnel. This occurred even in situations where the fulltime, on-site faculty were evaluated and monitored exclusively by the academic department. That this could create large quality control problems for the department is obvious.

> ...the best course of action is to insist on even more stringent and more visible quality control measures for the outreach portion of the program than are used for the on-campus portion....Even the importance of actually providing the educational opportunity to earn a degree at a remote site cannot surpass the importance of establishing sound quality control measures that allow substantial monitoring by the campus-based department (Miller, et al., 1984).

It is important, then, for a department to consider carefully whether it is likely to be able to build into the proposed program sufficient quality control measures to insure not only the quality of the extended program, but also the perception of quality both on and off campus.

CONCLUSION

A Communication department which is contemplating the development of an extended degree program faces many more complicated and complex issues than simply how to transport its on-campus program to a remote site. The purpose of this discussion was to give some direction and structure to a department's early efforts at deciding whether or not to even attempt the development of an extended program. It was an effort to list some of the considerations and questions about which faculty and administrators should seek some tentative understanding before committing to the task of developing an off-campus program.

By no means, was this intended to be a complete list of the questions and problems facing a department in its early discussions concerning an extended program nor was it offered to discourage such efforts. Rather, it was intended to alert those who are interested in engaging in extended programs about the inevitable tension and problems inherent in attempting to balance the need to be accountable to the institution from which one is extending and the need to be accountable to the learners one is attempting to reach.

It is this writer's belief that extending academic degree programs to the larger community, to nontraditional students who cannot interupt their lives to come to a traditional campus, is an important part of the modern educational enterprise and one on which we should expend considerable effort and energy. However, there needs to be a clear understanding of the range of issues involved as well as an understanding that to deliver an effective program of sufficient quality takes much more than simply wheels to get it off-campus.

REFERENCES

Cabell, H.W. (1985). "Extending the College to Serve Adults," in T.M. Rocco and L.R. Murphy (eds.), Institutional and Staff Structures for Nontraditional Programs. Scarecrow Press. Pp. 2-24.

Campbell, T.L. (1982). "Extension Academic Quality: Some Observations on Sharing Responsibility," Continuum, Vol. XLVI, No. 4. Pp. 10-16.

Chickering, A.W. (1985). "Foreword," in T.M. Rocco and L.R. Murphy (eds.), Institutional and Staff Structures for Nontraditional Programs. Scarecrow Press. Pp. v-x.

Clarke, J.H., D.R. Holmes, and L.D. Ballard (1984). "Moving Conventional Academic Programs Off-Campus: Creating Conditions for Change," Continuum, Vol. 48, No. 2. Pp. 91-100.

Cross, K.P. and J.R. Valley (1974). Planning Non-Traditional Programs, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Garubo, R. (1981). "Regional Accreditation: The Hidden Asset of Quality Control for Off-Campus Credit Programs," in "Predictions, Practices, and Professionalism: Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Conference on Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs," Issues in Higher Education, 5(October). Pp. 163-166.

Hanna, D.E. (1981). "Securing Faculty Involvement in Continuing Education," Continuum, Vol. XLV, No. 4. Pp. 51-56.

Kerman, J.B. (1983). " 'But You Gotta Know the Territory': A Preliminary Argument for a Theory of Informal Needs Assessment in Continuing Education," Continuum, Vol. XLVII, No. 2, Pp. 29-33.

Kirby, K.C. (1981). "Continuing Education Does Not Equal Nontraditional Education," in "Predictions, Practices, and Professionalism: Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Conference on Quality in Off-Campus Credit Programs," Issues in Higher Education, 5(October). Pp. 231-238.

Marienau, C. (1985). "Effective Liaison Within the Institution," in T.M. Rocco and L.R. Murphy (eds.), Institutional and Staff Structures for Nontraditional Programs. Scarecrow Press. Pp. 37-62.

Matusak, L. and R. Dowd (1985). "Administrative Structures for Alternative Degree Programs," in T.M. Rocco and L.R. Murphy (eds.), Institutional and Staff Structures for Nontraditional Programs. Scarecrow Press. Pp. 25-36.

Medsker, L.L. and S.L. Edelstein (1977). Policymaking Guidelines for Extended Degree Programs: A Revision. Washington: American Council on Education.

Miller, K.A., H.E. Chesteen, and J.R. Wiebler (1984). "Offering a Part-Time Bachelor of Social Work Degree Program in Rural Areas," Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, Vol. 3, No. 1. Pp. 33-41.

Miller, K.A. and J. Holloway (1986). "Administrative and Academic Linkages of Regional Campuses to Central Campuses." Paper presented to the Sixteeth Annual Conference of Regional Campus Administrators (Columbus, Indiana).

Valley, J.R. (1972). "External Degree Programs," in S.B. Gould and K.P. Cross (eds.), Explorations in Non-Traditional Study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walshok, M.L. (1982). "Designing Programs Responsive to Community Needs: Marketing as a Tool for Extension Leaders," Continuum, Vol. XLVII, No. 1. Pp. 15-23.

Watson, G. (1974). "Origins, Intent, and Current Developments," in S. Baskin (ed), Organizing Nontraditional Study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Pp. 1-18.